

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 11-20 stand rejected.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,185,163 issued to Helmet Schedele (hereinafter referred to as “Schedele”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,332,985 issued to Horst Hendel (hereinafter referred to as “Hendel”) and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,252,479 issued to Kern et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Kern”).

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s finding that the Schedele-Kern combination renders claim 1 obvious, because the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, especially as amended.

The Examiner relies on Schedele disclosing a magnet system for a relay (see Figures 5 and 6) comprising a core (Figure 5, center portion of multi-component yoke 25 through the coil) partially enclosed by a coil 24, a yoke (left portion of multi-component yoke 25) having a first yoke leg attached to a first end of the core (left portion of multi-component yoke 25 perpendicular to the core) and a second yoke leg extending parallel to the core (left portion of multi-component yoke 25 above the coil 24), the second yoke leg having an armature mounting portion (Figure 5) formed on an upper side of the second yoke leg remote from the coil, a pole

(right portion of the multi-component yoke 25) having a first pole leg (right portion of the multi-component yoke 25 perpendicular to the core) connected to a second end of the core and a second pole leg extending parallel to the core (right portion of the multi-component yoke 25 above the coil 24), the second pole leg having an armature 26 is mounted on the armature mounting portion, a working air gap is formed between a coil-side armature face and the upper surface of the second pole leg (figure 5), and a fixed contact carrier 31 with a fixed contact 29. Indeed, the Applicants agree with the Examiner's assertion that Schedele fails to teach that the magnet system is extrusion coated with a plastic material, the coil, the yoke, the pole, and the fixed contact carrier being embedded in the plastic material. The Examiner, however, indicates that Schedele does not show how the contact carrier 29 is secured to the insulating blocks 30, 31, having to rely on Hendel to teach a magnet system for a relay (figure 1) wherein the contact carrier 12 has side portions to hold the contact carrier in the coil pockets. Furthermore, the Examiner relies on Hendel to teach that the magnet system is extrusion coated with a plastic material, the coil, the yoke, the pole, and the fixed contact carrier being embedded in the plastic material.

Claim 1 has been amended to require, inter alia, a magnet system for a relay comprising a core partially enclosed by a coil, a yoke having a first yoke leg attached to a first end of the core and a second yoke leg extending parallel to the core, the second yoke leg having an armature mounting portion formed on an upper side of the second yoke leg remote from the coil, a pole having a first pole leg connected to a second end of the core and a second pole leg extending parallel to the core, the second pole leg having an upper surface substantially aligned with the armature mounting portion such that when an armature is mounted on the armature mounting portion, a working air gap is formed between a coil-side armature face and the upper surface of

the second pole leg, a fixed contact carrier with a fixed contact, the fixed contact carrier *having side portions that extend from the fixed contact carrier and hold the fixed contact carrier in pockets of the coil*, and the magnet system is extrusion coated with a plastic material, the coil, the yoke, the pole, and the fixed contact carrier being embedded in the plastic material.

In the least, the Schedele-Hendel-Kern does not teach nor suggest a fixed contact carrier *having side portions that extend from the fixed contact carrier and hold the fixed contact carrier in pockets of the coil*. The Examiner's attention is redirected to paragraph [0020] of the printed publication which describes a second pole leg 6a and optionally offset therefrom, a fixed contact carrier 9. *Side portions 9b hold the fixed contact carrier 9 in pockets 13a of the side arm 13 of the coil body 12* and the fixed contact carrier 9 is integrally connected to a terminal pin 9 a via a terminal portion. The fixed contact 8 is arranged parallel to surfaces of the armature mounting portion 7 a and the second pole leg 6a. *The fixed contact 8, however, is arranged closer to the core in a lower plane to optimize installation space*. The side portions 9b, as shown in Figure 4, extend from end walls of the contact carrier. According to the Examiner, Hendel teaches a contact carrier having side portions to hold the contact carrier in coil pockets (citing Figure 1).

Instead, Hendel merely teaches a fixed counter-contact element 12 fastened to a contact piece 13 in the coil flange 2, and when the relay is excited, the armature 9 is drawn to the end 5a of the core on the pole side and thus closes the contact between the contact pieces 11 and 13 (see Figure 1 in light of column 3, lines 43-66). There are no side portions extending from the contact piece. Furthermore, the contact piece is not held in pockets of a side arm of a coil body, but rather, in a coil flange.

As discussed, Schedele also lacks such a teaching. That which Schedele and Hendel lack is not taught or suggested by Kern. Therefore, claim 1, nor those that depend therefrom, namely

claims 2-9, cannot be held obvious in light of the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested.

Claim 11, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schedele in view of Hendel and in further view of Kern. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's finding that the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination renders claim 11 obvious, because the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 11, especially as amended.

Claim 11, has been amended, requiring, inter alia, an electromagnetic relay comprising a magnet system having a core body with a core partially enclosed by a coil, a yoke having a first yoke leg attached to a first end of the core and a second yoke leg extending parallel to the core having an armature mounting portion, a pole having a first pole leg connected to a second end of the core and a second pole leg extending parallel to the core; the magnet system having a fixed contact arranged on a fixed contact carrier substantially aligned with the second pole leg, the fixed contact carrier being offset in a direction of the core and arranged in the coil body, *the fixed contact carrier having side portions that extend from the fixed contact carrier and hold the fixed contact carrier in pockets of the coil*, and the magnet system is extrusion coated with a plastic material, the coil, the yoke, the pole, and the fixed contact carrier being embedded in the plastic material.

As discussed above in the claim 1 remarks, Schedele or Hendel, in the least, fail to teach or suggest a *fixed contact carrier having side portions that extend from the fixed contact carrier and hold the fixed contact carrier in pockets of the coil*. That which Schedele and Hendel lack is not taught or suggested by Kern. Therefore, claim 11, and those that depend therefrom, namely

claims 12-18, cannot be held obvious in light of the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested.

Claim 19, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schedele in view of Hendel and in further view of Kern. Claim 19 is amended similar to claims 1 and 11. As discussed above, the Schedele-Hendel-Kern combination does not, in the least, teach nor suggest *a fixed contact carrier having side portions that extend from the fixed contact carrier and hold the fixed contact carrier in pockets of the coil*. Therefore, independent claim 19, and dependent claim 20, cannot be held obvious for the same reasons. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested.

### **Conclusion**

For all of the foregoing reasons and in view of the foregoing amendments, the Applicants respectfully contend that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-20 and issuance of a Patent for the subject invention. If the Examiner cares to discuss anything presented here to further prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for the Applicants. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

/sa/

PTO Customer No.: 29450  
Dated: October 1, 2009

---

Salvatore Anastasi  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Registration No. 39,090  
Telephone No.: 610.722.3899  
Facsimile No.: 610.889-3696